



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,919	07/17/2003	Alan G. Noraker	1162-227	2754

7590 03/08/2005

David F. Zinger
SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.
Suite 1200
1560 Broadway
Denver, CO 80202-5141

EXAMINER

ROWAN, KURT C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3643

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/622,919

Applicant(s)

NORAKER, ALAN G.

Examiner

Kurt Rowan

Art Unit

3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 20, 2004 has been entered.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the middle portion of the single strap element must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering

Art Unit: 3643

of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the middle portion of the single strap element.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1, 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, it is stated that in the open state said attaching end is interconnected to said inner area of the first flap through a middle portion of said single strap element. This is confusing since not only is the attaching end free in the open state, but also it attaches to the flap by the attached end of the strap. Please clarify/correct.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fleming for substantially the same reasons stated in the first Office Action.

The patent to Fleming shows a fishing line container having a first flap 10, 12 having an outer area and an inner area. Fleming shows a first strap having a single strap element of two parts 16, 18; having an attached end and being defined by an open state and a closed state. The strap being usable to join a first spool to the flap when the strap is in a closed state. Fleming shows the first strap interconnected to the inner area 10 of the first flap. Fleming shows the first strap having an open state and a closed state.

Fleming shows the first strap having an attaching end which is the end attached to area 12 of the flap. In the closed state, the attaching end being interconnected to the inner area of the first flap by way of the attached end of the first strap. In reference to claim 5, Fleming shows a flap with a hinged section 12 and a movable section 10 with the attached end of the strap being closer to the movable section than to the hinged section. In reference to claim 9, Fleming shows a cover 48. In reference to claim 13, Fleming shows a second cover 50 having a first connection segment 54 joined to the flap by way of edge portion 52. Fleming shows a second connection segment 40, 44,

Art Unit: 3643

36 joined to the flap adjacent the first connection segment. In reference to claim 14, Fleming shows a flap with a hinged section 12 with hinge 14 at the junction between the hinged section 12 and the section 10 is a slot that forms an access hole adjacent the hinged section for receiving fishing line. In reference to claim 15, Fleming shows a primary container 22. In reference to claim 16, Fleming shows a support subassembly 56, 58.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleming as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Uso, Jr.

The patent to Fleming shows a fishing line and tackle container as discussed above. Fleming shows a strap as a belt with a buckle. The patent to Uso shows a Velcro strap to retain fishing equipment. In reference to claim 4, it would have been obvious to provide Fleming with a Velcro strap as shown by Uso since merely one mechanical equivalent strap is being substituted for another and the function is the same.

5. Claims 6-7, 8, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleming.

The patent to Fleming shows a fishing line and tackle container as discussed above. Fleming does not show that the lateral extent of the inner area having a length and the

Art Unit: 3643

length of the first strap greater than one-half the length of the lateral extent. However, it would have been obvious to employ a first strap length greater than one-half the lateral extent since changes in size are obvious. See *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 137. In reference to claim 7, Fleming shows one strap but it would have been obvious to employ two straps for multiplied effect. See *In re Harza*, 124 USPQ 378. In reference to claim 8, Fleming shows what appears to be a stitched connection between the belt or strap and the inner wall 10. Fleming shows a snap connection 58 to shut the tackle box. It would have been obvious to employ a snap connection is merely one connection is being substituted for another and the function is the same.

6. Claims 1, 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiser in view of Schloss.

The patent to Kiser shows a fishing line container having a flap 12 having an inner area and an outer area. Kiser shows at least a first strap 46, 46 having an attached end and being defined by a single state since the strap does not appear to move. The strap being usable to join a first spool 44 to said flap when the first strap is in its single state. The patent to Schloss shows a spool of line 4 having a strap 5 being usable to join the spool to flap 1 when in a closed state as shown in Fig. 2. The open state is shown in Fig. 1. In reference to claims 1 and 17, 19, it would have been obvious to provide the fishing line and tackle container of Kiser with a strap as shown by Schloss since merely one strap is being substituted for and another and the function is the same. Since the strap frictionally holds the line, pulling the line from the spool causes tension in the line due to the force between the line and the strap. Schloss shows the both the first and

Art Unit: 3643

second section of the spool having the strap wrapped around the spool, but it would have been obvious to leave the second section of the spool free from the strap such as for example in situations when the spool is too thick for the strap to wrap around the second section which would be the top section in Fig. 2 or to bypass the bottom section of the spool and wrap the strap around the top section only which would result in the subject matter of claim 19. It should be pointed out that an omission of an element with consequent loss of its function is obvious. See *In re Kuhle*, 188 USPQ 7. Kiser shows a cover 16, 21 overlying the first spool as shown in Fig. 3. Kiser shows positioning at least portions of the first spool under the cover. It appears that the method shown by Kiser as modified by Schloss inserts the strap while the bore is located outwardly of the cover or how could the strap be inserted into the bore if the cover was closed? In reference to claim 23, Schloss shows in the closed state, a first surface of the strap at a first location along the strap is adjacent the first surface of the strap at a second location along the strap. In reference to claim 24, Schloss shows the area of the strap in the closed state having a length that is less than a diameter of the spool since the distance between 2 and 2a plus 3 and 3a is less than the distance between 3 and 2a as shown in Fig. 1.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kurt Rowan whose telephone number is 703 308-2321. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 3643

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on 703 308-2574. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kurt Rowan", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Kurt Rowan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3643

KR